



PATENT  
39003.816US01

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re patent application of:  
Gregory A. PICCIONELLI

Group Art Unit: 2614

Examiner: Q. Nguyen

Serial No. 10/822,212

Filed: April 9, 2004

For: VIDEO PRODUCTION WITH  
SELECTABLE CAMERA ANGLES

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION  
UNDER 37 CFR 1.116

Mail Stop AF  
Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

In response to the Office Action of December 5, 2008, claims 1-4 are submitted for further consideration in view of the following remarks.

The PTO initially refers to 35 USC §112, ¶2; however, the PTO does not appear to have formally rejected the claims under this section or presented a basis for such a rejection. The PTO provides "examples of language that *may* raise a question as to the limiting effect of the language in a claim" (emphasis added), but does not explicitly state that any particular recitations in the present claims raise such a "question," still less specifically assert that any of the claims fail to comply with the requirements of §112, ¶2 or explain how such claims fail to do so. Without such a specific assertion, applicant is unable to formulate a response. Applicant therefore requests that the PTO point out with particularity which of the pending claims are considered not to comply with §112, ¶2 and why such claims do not comply with the requirements of that section. In the absence of such an assertion, applicant submits that all present claims meet the requirements of §112, ¶2.

Claims 1-4 also stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as allegedly obvious over Hendricks et al. '386, of record, in view of Ito et al., newly cited. With respect to claims 1 and 3, the PTO is heard to state that the Hendricks et al. reference discloses every limitation of the claims except for the use of a processor generating a smooth transitional view between at least two of the plurality of cameras, whereby a continuous change of camera angle is provided. The PTO cites Ito et al.'s